

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 14, 15, 19, 24 and 25 are pending in this application. By the above amendments, claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 14, 15 and 19 are amended, claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 9-13, 16-18 and 20-23 are canceled and claims 24 and 25 are newly added. Favorable reconsideration of the application and allowance of all of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The Office Action objects to the specification for the terminology “validating the data” in claim 12. Claim 12 has been canceled.

The Office Action objects to the drawings because certain reference numerals in the drawings are not mentioned in the text. In reply, the specification is amended herein at pages 7 and 8 to include text that refers to reference numerals 1310, 1450 and 1650. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments made to the specification are fully supported by the text of the present application at page 6, line 14 to page 7, line 14.

The Office Action objects to claim 13 as allegedly lacking sufficient antecedent basis. The claims have been extensively amended and claim 13 has been canceled by this Amendment.

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 13 as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. In reply, these claims are amended herein to remove the term “IC5232”.

The Office Action rejects claims 8-11 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, allegedly that the term “at traffic rates” is indefinite. In reply, claims 8 and 19 are amended herein to clarify that the relevant functions or operations are performed at a rate comparable to a data transfer rate of traffic carrying the unencrypted data. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claims 8 and 19 obviate this rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6-14, 16, 17 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)/(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,052,786 to Tsuchida (hereinafter “Tsuchida”). The Office Action rejects claim 3-5, 18, 19 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Tsuchida.

In this amendment, claims 1 and 14 are amended to recite in somewhat detail the operational flow and architecture shown in FIG. 2 of the present application. In particular, these claims now recite that the header is validated under control of first and second validation state machine logic elements. The first validation state machine logic element controls the examination of the header for validation check and when the header is determined to be valid, the first validation state machine logic signals the second validation state machine logic indicating that a valid header is ready to transfer. When the second validation state machine logic receives this signaling, it enables transfer of the valid header to the merge logic. This aspect of the invention is clearly shown in FIG. 2 of the present application and described at page 6, line 14 to page 7, line 14, and at page 7, line 15 to page 8, line 19.

New claims 24 and 25 are directed to further details of the present invention described on page 7, lines 5-14, pertaining to the first and second doors 1450 and 1650 shown in FIG. 2.

Tsuchida makes no teaching or suggestion of first and second validation state machine logic functions as described above and shown in FIG. 2 of the present application. As described in the specification of the present application and now recited in claims 1 and 14, the first and second validation state machines communicate with each other in order to expedite the bypassing of the encryption algorithm. Furthermore, as recited in new claims 24 and 25, the first validation state machine informs the second validation state machine that the first door logic is open, and in response the second validation state machine opens the second door logic because there is no need to wait for encrypted data to be matched with a header. The two doors can operate independently and can communicate with each other to establish “trust” between them.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to find the application to be in condition for allowance with claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 14, 15, 19, 24 and 25. However, if for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time that may be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of

ELECTRONIC FILING
AMENDMENT

any additional fees required for the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to
Deposit Account No. 05-0460.

Dated: February 28, 2007

Respectfully submitted by:

EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC
CUSTOMER NO. 27896
1901 Research Boulevard, Suite 400
Rockville, MD 20850
(301) 424-3640

/D. Andrew Floam/
D. Andrew Floam
Reg. No. 34597